

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 15-18 and 25-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Turning first to claim 1, the issue concerning antecedent has been addressed by amending the claim as shown above.

In claim 1, the Examiner further questioned the claim language “the first reference frequency of the main loop is ... c) removed by a whole integer multiple of the transmit or receive frequency spacing the received frequency from the cut-off frequency of the main loop.” The Examiner notes the specification paragraph 59 language and requests clarification as to what this claim language means. Applicants submit that the issues concerning understanding of the claim language arise from the translation of the French priority application. Applicants will first address what the specification language means, and then address whether modification to the claim language is required.

The specification teaches the frequency reference SRFP of the main loop is frequency spaced from a whole multiple of the transmit or receive frequency. The value of this frequency spacing is at least equal to the cut off frequency of the main loop. The original French language text utilized the French term “éloignée de” which was translated as “removed by”. It would appear that this translation is perhaps confusing, and that perhaps a better English term for the translation could have been used. In the context of the description, the French term “éloignée de” which was translated as “removed by” may further be understood to mean “distanced away from.” In other words, according to the invention as disclosed, the reference frequency of the main loop is set away from (it is removed from or distanced from) a frequency which is a whole

integer multiple of the transmit or receive frequency. Additionally, the value of the frequential distance (spacing) between the reference frequency of the main loop and any whole integer multiple of the transmit or receive frequency is at least the value of the cut-off frequency of the main loop.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claim language “removed by” is now well understood. However, it does not appear as if the claim language accurately reflects the disclosed operation. So, Applicants propose an amendment to claim 1 to clarify the claim language in accordance with the understanding of the disclosure as presented above. Amended claim 1 now recites “the first reference frequency of the main loop is ... c) removed from a frequency which is by a whole integer multiple of the transmit or receive frequency, the spacing the reference frequency of the main loop and a whole integer multiple of the transmit or receive frequency is at least ~~from~~ the cut-off frequency of the main loop.” These amendments address the issues noted by the Examiner. Claims 1-8 are now believed to be in condition for favorable action and allowance.

To the extent the Examiner believes it would be helpful, Applicants would agree to amend both the specification and claims to replace the “removed by” language and instead recite “set away from” or “distanced from” (or the like).

Turning next to claim 9, the issue concerning antecedent has been addressed by amending the claim as shown above.

In claim 9, the Examiner further questioned the claim language “if a frequency of the local oscillator output signal were reduced to a frequency of the second reference signal.” The Examiner notes the specification paragraph 62 language and requests clarification as to what this

claim language means. Applicants submit that the issues concerning understanding of the claim language can be resolved by further consideration of the specification and the examples contained therein. Applicants will first address what the specification teaches, and then address whether modification to the claim language is required.

An understanding of what is meant by “reduced to” may be obtained with reference to the example of paragraph 61. The spacing of the channels for a transmit/receive frequency of about 1.8 GHz is 200 kHz. Now, with respect to the output signal SSP of the main oscillator operating at 3.6 GHz, the spacing of the channels is not 200 kHz (as above), but is rather 400 kHz (i.e., 2 times 200 kHz) because 3.6 GHz is two times 1.8 GHz. What is being illustrated by this example is a form of scaling the channel spacing in terms of the frequency signal at issue.

Thus, for determining the frequency reference SFRP of the main loop with respect to the frequency spacing of the channels, you cannot use the channel spacing in terms of the transmit/receive frequency (e.g., 200 kHz), but rather the frequency spacing determined at the frequency output of the main oscillator (e.g., 400 kHz due to the 2x scaling relationship between the frequencies). In other words, in accordance with the claim language, it is the frequency in the context of being reduced to (or scaled to) the frequency reference SFRP of the main loop.

In claim 9, the language “if a frequency of the local oscillator output signal were reduced to a frequency of the second reference signal” presents a condition. The first reference signal is equal to the frequency spacing of the channels, if (the condition) the local oscillator frequency is scaled to (reduced to) the second reference signal frequency. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claim language “reduced to” is well understood. It is further asserted that given this understanding, there is no need to amend the claim at this time.

CUSTOMER NO. 32914

PATENT APPLICATION
Docket No. 61170-19USPX

Withdrawal of the objection to claim 9 is requested. Claims 9-12, 15-18 and 31 are accordingly in condition for allowance.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, to the extent the Examiner believes it would be helpful, Applicants would agree to amend both the specification and claims to replace the "reduced to" language and instead recite "scaled to" (or the like).

With respect to claim 25, the Examiner has identified an antecedent issue and an issue with respect to the "removed by" language. Claim 25 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1 to address both of these issues. Allowance of claims 25-31 is requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for favorable action and allowance.

Dated: August 15, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Andre M. Szuwalski

Registration No.: 35,701

GARDERE WYNNE SEWELL LLP

3000 Thanksgiving Tower,

1601 Elm Street

Dallas, Texas 75201

(214) 999-4795

Attorneys For Applicant